



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,936	11/05/2001	Robert F. Kaiko	200.1102CP2	9880

23280 7590 02/04/2002

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC  
485 SEVENTH AVENUE, 14TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10018

EXAMINER

WARE, TODD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1615	

DATE MAILED: 02/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/992,936	KAIKO ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Todd D Ware	1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3,6-32 and 34-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3,6-32 and 34-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

Receipt of preliminary amendment filed 11-5-01 is acknowledged. Claims 2, 4-5, and 33 have been canceled and claims 1, 12-18, and 32 have been amended as requested. Claims 1, 3, 6-32, and 34-36 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8-10, 12-18, 21-26, 32, 34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crain et al (5,512,578; hereafter '578) in view of Hynes (EP 0 193 355; hereafter '355) or Crain et al (5,512,578; hereafter '578) in view of Raffa et al (5,336,691; hereafter '691) or Crain et al (5,512,578; hereafter '578) in view of Dudzinski (4,237,140; hereafter '140).

The instant claims are directed toward combination opioid agonist/antagonist/acetaminophen oral formulations and a method for treating pain with the combination opioid agonist/antagonist/acetaminophen oral formulations.

'578 teaches oral compositions comprising opioid agonists and opioid antagonists that may be used for treating opioid abuse. '578 also teaches a method

Art Unit: 1615

treating pain with the disclosed composition. '578 does not teach the inclusion of non-narcotic analgesics in the disclosed formulation.

'355, '691, and '140 all teach inclusion of non-narcotic analgesics, such as acetaminophen in narcotic formulations. These references show that the interaction between the active agents is superadditive or synergistic.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include non-narcotic analgesics in the formulation of '578 in an effort to provide enhanced analgesia by means of producing analgesia through non-opioid antinociceptive pathways. Furthermore, since the interactions are synergistic, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use doses that would otherwise be subtherapeutic if given alone with the motivation of maintaining low instance of side effects while maintaining an analgesic dose.

3. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8-10, 12-18, 21-26, 32, 34, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon et al (4,457,933; hereafter '933) in view of Hynes (EP 0 193 355; hereafter '355) or Gordon et al (4,457,933; hereafter '933) in view of Raffa et al (5,336,691; hereafter '691) or Gordon et al (4,457,933; hereafter '933) in view of Dudzinski (4,237,140; hereafter '140).

'933 also teaches opioid agonist and opioid antagonist composition and methods for treating pain. '933 does not teach inclusion of non-narcotic analgesics in the taught formulations.

'355, '691, and '140 are all relied upon for all that they teach as stated previously.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include non-narcotic analgesics in the formulation of '933 in an effort to provide enhanced analgesia by means of producing analgesia through non-opioid antinociceptive pathways. Furthermore, since the interactions are synergistic, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use doses that would otherwise be subtherapeutic if given alone with the motivation of maintaining low instance of side effects while maintaining an analgesic dose.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crain et al (5,512,578; hereafter '578) in combination with Hynes (EP 0 193 355; hereafter '355) and further in combination with Gauthier et al (5,552,422; hereafter '422) or Crain et al (5,512,578; hereafter '578) in combination with Raffa et al (5,336,691; hereafter '691) and further in combination with Gauthier et al (5,552,422; hereafter '422) or Crain et al (5,512,578; hereafter '578) in combination with Dudzinski (4,237,140; hereafter '140) and further in combination with Gauthier et al (5,552,422; hereafter '422).

'578, '355, '691, and '140 are all relied upon for all that they teach as stated previously. None of these references teaches inclusion of an additional non-opioid drug as required in instant claim 7.

'422 teaches combination of COX-2 inhibitors with acetaminophen and opioids (C 9, L 25-C 10, L 14).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine these teachings and include a COX-2 inhibitor in the above

Art Unit: 1615

obvious formulations to provide enhanced analgesia by means of producing analgesia through non-opioid and non-acetaminophen antinociceptive pathways.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon et al (4,457,933; hereafter '933) in combination with Hynes (EP 0 193 355; hereafter '355) and further in combination with Gauthier et al (5,552,422; hereafter '422) or Gordon et al (4,457,933; hereafter '933) in combination with Raffa et al (5,336,691; hereafter '691) and further in combination with Gauthier et al (5,552,422; hereafter '422) or Gordon et al (4,457,933; hereafter '933) in combination with Dudzinski (4,237,140; hereafter '140) and further in combination with Gauthier et al (5,552,422; hereafter '422).

'933, '355, '691, and '140 are all relied upon for all that they teach as stated previously. None of these references teaches inclusion of an additional non-opioid drug as required in instant claim 7.

'422 teaches combination of COX-2 inhibitors with acetaminophen and opioids (C 9, L 25-C 10, L 14).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine these teachings and include a COX-2 inhibitor in the above obvious formulations to provide enhanced analgesia by means of producing analgesia through non-opioid and non-acetaminophen antinociceptive pathways.

6. Claims 11, 19-20, 27-31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crain et al (5,512,578; hereafter '578) in combination with Hynes (EP

Art Unit: 1615

0 193 355; hereafter '355) and further in combination with Oshlack et al (5,472,712; hereafter '712) or Crain et al (5,512,578; hereafter '578) in combination with Raffa et al (5,336,691; hereafter '691) and further in combination with Oshlack et al (5,472,712; hereafter '712) or Crain et al (5,512,578; hereafter '578) in combination with Dudzinski (4,237,140; hereafter '140) and further in combination with Oshlack et al (5,472,712; hereafter '712).

'578, '355, '691, and '140 are all relied upon for all that they teach as stated previously. None of these references controlled release formulations as required in the instant claims.

'712 teaches controlled release opioid formulations that meet the instant claims.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to provide controlled release formulations of the obvious previous compositions to reduce the frequency of administration.

7. Claims 11, 19-20, 27-31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon et al (4,457,933; hereafter '933) in combination with Hynes (EP 0 193 355; hereafter '355) and further in combination with Oshlack et al (5,472,712; hereafter '712) or Gordon et al (4,457,933; hereafter '933) in combination with Raffa et al (5,336,691; hereafter '691) and further in combination with Oshlack et al (5,472,712; hereafter '712) or Gordon et al (4,457,933; hereafter '933) in combination with Dudzinski (4,237,140; hereafter '140) and further in combination with Oshlack et al (5,472,712; hereafter '712).

Art Unit: 1615

'933, '355, '691, and '140 are all relied upon for all that they teach as stated previously. None of these references controlled release formulations as required in the instant claims.

'712 teaches controlled release opioid formulations that meet the instant claims.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to provide controlled release formulations of the obvious previous compositions to reduce the frequency of administration.

### ***Double Patenting***

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321<sup>®</sup> may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1-36 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-50 of U.S. Patent No. 6,277,384. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both are drawn to methods of use for oral

Art Unit: 1615

opioid agonist/antagonist compositions. Furthermore, the method of 6,277,384 discloses the compositions of the instant application.

10. Claims 1-36 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-36 of copending Application No. 09/503,020. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both are drawn to methods of use for oral opioid agonist/antagonist compositions. Furthermore, the method of Application No. 09/503,020 discloses the compositions of the instant application. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Conclusion***

11. Currently, no claim is allowed. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Todd D Ware whose telephone number is (703) 305-1700. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 6 PM, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K Page can be reached on (703)308-2927. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) for regular communications and (703) for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 1615

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1234.

*G S Kishore*  
Gollamudi S. Kishore, PhD  
Primary Examiner  
Group 1600

tw  
January 14, 2002